



HJW

OBLON
SPIVAK
McCLELLAND
MAIER
&
NEUSTADT
P.C.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Docket No.: 243521US6

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

RE: Application Serial No.: 10/678,062

Applicants: Tomio HIRANO, et al.

Filing Date: October 6, 2003

For: MULTILAYER WIRING BOARD, TOUCH PANEL
AND MANUFACTURING METHOD OF THE SAME

Group Art Unit: 2841

Examiner: Jeremy C. Norris

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Our check in the amount of **\$0.00** is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle

Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number

22850

(703) 413-3000 (phone)

(703) 413-2220 (fax)

I:\ATTY\BDL\24S\243521US\243521US.PTO_042806.doc

Scott A. McKeown
Registration No. 42,866

DOCKET NO: 243521US6



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF

TOMIO HIRANO, ET AL. : EXAMINER: JEREMY C. NORRIS

SERIAL NO: 10/678,062 :

FILED: OCTOBER 6, 2003 : GROUP ART UNIT: 2841

FOR: MULTILAYER WIRING BOARD,
TOUCH PANEL AND
MANUFACTURING METHOD OF THE
SAME

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Restriction Requirement stated in the Official Action dated March 28, 2006, Applicants in the above-identified patent application provisionally elect Group I, Claims 1-3 and 7-9, drawn to a printed circuit board.

The Restriction Requirement asserts that the application contains claims to distinct inventions. However, MPEP §803 states the following:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

The claims of the present invention would appear to be of an overlapping search area.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully **traverse** the Restriction Requirement on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a *serious* burden on the Examiner.

However, if the present Restriction Requirement is not withdrawn, examination on the merits of the Claims of Group I is believed to be in order, and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Scott A. McKeown
Registration No. 42,866

I:\ATTY\BDL\24s\243521US\243521US.RESTRICTION.DOCDOCUMENT7